



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the keenness of the senses of the primitive Germans: "We have a *Beise*, *Pfieffe*, *Geis*, *Josse*, *Orke*, *Gude*, *Dispe*, etc., according as the sound [of a stream] was more a rushing, whistling, seething, hissing, roaring, foaming, or humming." But now, he says, it is nothing but *Klingen*, — just as every pond in New England is now christened "Crystal Lake" or "Silver Lake."

3. — *Grandes Figures Historiques*. Par AUGUSTE LAUGEL. Paris : Michel Lévy Frères. New York : G. P. Putnam's Sons.

M. LAUGEL's latest work gives fresh evidence of his qualifications for playing the difficult and too often thankless part of international literary medium. The author who devotes himself to fostering literary intercourse, spiritual contact, so to speak, between his nation and its neighbors, cannot look for such general and immediate recognition as usually rewards his more stay-at-home brother. Yet in these days, when national thought and culture are gradually wearing away their distinctive features, and assuming the character of *Weltliteratur*, as Goethe has observed, it behooves the critic to give careful heed to the labors of men like Laugel, who are attracting their nation little by little into new channels. The time was when France was cosmopolitan in the sense that its great writers made Continental Europe tributary by imposing their own standard and modes of thinking; the time seems to be at hand when France is to become cosmopolitan in another, and, to our mind, higher sense, by abdicating its assumed supremacy and going abroad as a diligent scholar who seeks to learn exactly how and why other people feel and act as they do.

In this talent for expatriation, M. Laugel is among the foremost. Indeed, it would not be easy to name another of his countrymen who surpasses him in the ability to write from a foreign point of view, to catch the spirit of foreign institutions or character, and impart it in a manner that is at once French and not French, — French in its cast of style, not French in the fresh life that it brings from over the border.

The reader has had the opportunity of studying M. Laugel's "England, Social and Political," an English translation of which was published by the Putnams last year. Whatever minor defects that book may betray, it has unquestionably one quality of rare value; it is the overflowing of a mind thoroughly *en rapport* with a theme of bewildering variety and magnitude. One feels, in reading it, that the au-

thor has really experienced for himself all that he utters; one perceives not only the outward institutions of England, but the very movement of the forces that make its national life. We are not blind admirers of M. Laugel's style. It strains too much after effect, it is too antithetical and epigrammatic. As Karl Hillebrand has justly observed, it is not French of the good old school. Yet it is uncommonly vivid, incisive, and pithy; it reveals great aptitude in condensation and suggestion.

The present volume differs from the "England," both in form and in composition. The style is much toned down, presenting few, perhaps no passages that will compare with many in the "England" for brilliancy. Furthermore, it is not a continuous essay, but a collection of detached pieces on John of Barneveldt and Maurice of Nassau, Sylvain van de Weyer, John Stuart Mill, Josiah Quincy, and Charles Sumner. The sketch of Barneveldt and Maurice, their quarrel, and its tragic issue, is based avowedly upon Mr. Motley's history, although matter is introduced here and there from other sources. It has the merit of presenting the case in a very readable shape, and of doing a trifle more justice to Maurice than Mr. Motley has done. Without attempting to palliate Maurice's brutality, M. Laugel shows how his conduct was the result of foreign complications, the frantic movement of the nation itself following unconsciously its destiny, rather than the gratification of mere personal hatred. The estimate of Mill's personality and influence is in the main a just one. Yet we doubt if Mill played or will play the important part in English affairs which M. Laugel is disposed to assign to him. The leaders of the materialistic school, Tyndal and Darwin, in their robustness of thought, and in the practical bent of their labors, are the antipodes of a speculative thinker and subtle dialectician like Mill; while, on the other hand, those whose faith and hopes are rooted in the past, and who hold that human nature and society are a growth and not a logical creation, will always be repelled by positivism in any shape. The radical defect in Mill's nature was a want of virile force. Even his personal weaknesses were feminine rather than masculine. This M. Laugel has divined, but without drawing therefrom the unavoidable conclusion, to wit, that a nature thus constituted is disqualified for leadership in social movements, in which the emotions and the will play the decisive part. The sketch of the life and labors of Josiah Quincy, the last of the Federalists, evinces the author's familiarity with American history and parties, and his ability to treat successfully a subject lying off the beaten track. There are one or two passages that we should like to correct, but for want of space must pass on to more important matters.

The essays fraught with most significance for us are those on Sylvain van de Weyer and Charles Sumner. Whether intended or not by the author, the two portraitures are in marked contrast. We view, on the one hand, an ardent, aggressive young pamphleteer and orator, we might almost say—despite M. Laugel's depreciation—a political agitator, who develops rapidly into a sober, perspicacious statesman, one of the mainstays of constitutional monarchy in Belgium, and passes away at a ripe old age as the beloved and admired ambassador at the tranquil Court of St. James. On the other hand, a sober-minded young lawyer and scholar, fit by nature for seclusion and research, abandoning his chosen studies, breaking with old friends and associations, entering the political arena in behalf of a righteous cause, triumphing indeed with that cause, but becoming more and more irritable and aggressive with each success, and dying rejected by the very party he had helped to create. Those who wish to study the formation of the existing constitutional monarchy in Belgium, how it came to be what it is, its trials, its tenure of existence, will find copious materials in Van de Weyer's life. We do not look upon Belgian independence as achieved beyond peradventure. The foreign complications are grave, and so also the domestic dissensions. In no other country, perhaps, is the dividing line between town and land, between enlightenment and religious serfdom, drawn so sharply. The so-called constitutionalism of the government is dangerously weak at many points, the administration is too sensitive to the oscillations of party elections. Yet, taken as it stands, the Belgian monarchy is an encouraging example of what may be accomplished by perseverance, tact, moderation, and timely concession. M. Laugel shows clearly and concisely how Van de Weyer co-operated towards the result, and we therefore commend his essay to all who are interested in the history of recent European politics.

The image of Charles Sumner is too fresh in the hearts of the American people to need comment from us. We have only to pass our opinion upon M. Laugel's treatment of his theme. We are free to say that among the countless orations, editorials, and articles that poured forth in a flood two years ago, we do not remember anything that has pleased us so much as the present essay. It is warm and manly in tone, graphic and comprehensive in statement. No one of Sumner's countrymen, — we regret to have to make the admission, — has treated him with such breadth of vision, or in such good taste. As depicted by M. Laugel, Sumner stands out not merely in his significance for America, but in his relations to the world at large. In addition to these merits of a general nature, the essay contains many

reminiscences of the author's personal intercourse with Sumner and other prominent men of the time. Much of the information thus conveyed is as novel as it is acceptable. We refer to Sumner's opinion (p. 343) concerning Everett's nomination as presidential elector in 1860; to Garrison's touching remarks (p. 347) concerning the inevitable dissolution of the Abolition Society, and his criticism of Seward's Auburn speech; to the author's conference (p. 351) with Seward, and the latter's views upon the Alabama affair, and our relations with Europe, and especially with France; and to the author's interview with Grant before Richmond (p. 357). M. Laugel's impressions of the literary circles of Boston and Cambridge (p. 349), and his strictures (p. 374) upon the nomination of Greeley instead of Adams, will be received with approbation, we are confident, by our readers.

While the essay is in general scrupulously exact, there are certain defects and errors which we deem it our duty to point out. In speaking of the Fugitive Slave Law (p. 328), the author calls it an attempt on the part of the slaveholders to make all the officials of the *confédération* their helpers in capturing runaways. We regard the word *confédération* as unfortunate. Perhaps from the French point of view it may be the proper term to apply to our national government, but it is too suggestive of the period from 1861–1865 to be acceptable to Americans. Besides, the paragraph conveys the truth only partially. The operation of the Slave Law was to place not only the officials of the United States, but also State officials, and even private citizens, at the beck and call of the slavehunters. Any one could be called upon to protect the marshals and police in case of interference or resistance. It was this last feature that provoked such an explosion of wrath, and made the law insupportable even for "Southern sympathizers." The author's account of the Missouri Compromise, and Douglas's Kansas-Nebraska Bill (p. 329), is unsatisfactory, not to say confusing. The American reader will be familiar with the dispute, but a Frenchman can scarcely gather from Laugel's meagre sentences facts enough for an opinion. Certainly he would not learn that the Compromise was effected in 1820, that Douglas's Bill was not passed until 1854, and that the repeal consequently broke up a status of peace that had existed for almost a quarter of a century. Nor would he learn the extreme pretension of the slaveholders, namely, that property in human beings was like every other kind of property, and therefore could not be prevented nor destroyed by act of Congress. Sumner's trenchant aphorism, "Freedom is national, slavery is sectional," which is cited with such approbation by Laugel, loses its point by this neglect to contrast it with the opposite

doctrine. We regard the term *congrès* (p. 327) as not applicable to the Legislature of Massachusetts. The account of the Brooks-Sumner affair (p. 330) is also unsatisfactory. On the one hand, in extenuation of Brooks's conduct, it might have been stated that Brooks declared it to be the satisfaction for Sumner's personal attack upon his uncle, Senator Butler. On the other hand, in aggravation of the offence, the French reader should have been informed that the assault was a trespass upon the Senate Chamber by a member of the lower House. M. Laugel says (p. 334), "He (Sumner) was ordered by his physicians to rest for several years. He was, nevertheless, re-elected at the expiration of his term; *soon afterwards* he resumed his place at Washington." Brooks's assault was perpetrated in 1856; Sumner was re-elected in 1857, but did not resume his seat until 1860. M. Laugel's phrase "*soon afterwards*," *peu après*, is therefore not only inaccurate, but it ignores one of the most noteworthy incidents in American history, namely, the "*eloquent vacant chair*" that bore witness for three years to Massachusetts' devotion to her disabled champion. It is stated (p. 336) that Sumner, in opposing Crittenden's compromise, "knew (*savait*) that every sacrifice would be useless, that the arsenals of the North had been stripped by the minister of war," etc. We doubt if Sumner or any of his party "knew" at that time what was going on at Norfolk and Brooklyn. Certainly none save the initiated had more than an inkling. In speaking of Sumner's death, the author says, "Four millions of blacks mourned for him whom they looked upon as their liberator; the bells of Charlestown tolled for one who had been so long detested in the Carolinas." Ordinarily slips of the pen or misprints can be passed over in a spirit of professional charity. But the present blunder robs the passage of its very meaning. However, it will be scarcely necessary to do more than call M. Laugel's attention to it, and remind him in a friendly way to disregard the advice given by Mr. Weller, senior, and *not* "to spell it with a wee."

We understand that the Messrs. Putnams have in view a translation of the present volume. Without attempting to anticipate their judgment, we take the liberty of suggesting that the translation be restricted to the essays on Van de Weyer and Sumner. We should be very glad to see these two made accessible to the public. For the others, the reader can be referred to the sources from which M. Laugel himself has drawn.